



**QUALITY ASSURANCE:**

**FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**February 2023**



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**Innovative higher education teaching contents for achieving sustainable ACCESSibility of CULTural heritage for ALL**  
**Project n° 2020-1-ES01-KA203-083220**

### Disclaimer:

The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

### Suggested citation:

ACCESSCULT Consortium (2020). Co-funded by The Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union. "Second Evaluation Report".

### More information on the ACCESSCULT Project can be found at:

<https://www.accesscult.eu/>

### Authors:

José Ángel Casas Barrigón (INFAD), Yolanda Gil González (University of Burgos), Mirian Santamaría Peláez (University of Burgos)

## Table of Contents

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	4
1.1. Internal Evaluation Methodology .....	4
1.2. Quality Control and Monitoring .....	4
<b>2. PROJECT OVERVIEW</b> .....	6
2.1 Project Description .....	6
2.2 Project wider objective .....	6
<b>3. QUALITY ASSURANCE</b> .....	7
<b>4. EVALUATION OF MAIN OBJECTIVES</b> .....	9
<b>5. EVALUATION OF WORK PACKAGES</b> .....	11
Analysis of Work Packages .....	13
WP1 - Project Management.....	13
WP2: In-depth Analysis and Specification of Learning Outcomes .....	19
WP3: HE modules "Cultural Heritage for All" development .....	22
WP4: (On-line) adult training "Cultural Heritage for All" development .....	25
WP5: Testing and Implementation phase.....	28
WP6: Promotion and Dissemination Campaign.....	33
WP7: Exploitation and Sustainability Plan .....	37
<b>6. QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP</b> .....	39
6.1 RESULTS OF THE 4 QUESTIONNAIRES .....	39
6.2 COMMENTS FROM FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE .....	39
<b>7. CRITICAL POINTS AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN</b> .....	42

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Internal Evaluation Methodology

In order to carry out the Final Internal Evaluation of AccessCULT project, the internal evaluator has had full access to all relevant external and internal documents on project's Drive, partners' emails related to Intellectual Outputs (IOs), Partner Meetings and Work Packages, and to the contents of the project's website: [www.accesscult.eu](http://www.accesscult.eu). Moreover, in order to summarize/clarify some evaluation findings, the evaluator used email communication with University of Burgos as well as with other partners.

In the same line to the first and second evaluation report methodology, this final report starts with an introduction of the quality control management as well as the project overview and main objectives. Afterwards, a detail analysis of planned and achieved deliverables through a cross-matching with [Monitoring Chart](#) was done in order to define to which extent the quality of results meet the plan according to the available indicators.

After this thorough detail, evaluation focuses on partners' opinions, collected through the Effective Partnership Questionnaire. Finally, a summary with findings and critical points are given in the report by internal evaluator.

### 1.2. Quality Control and Monitoring

Project activities and results are monitored continuously throughout the lifetime of the project and evaluated at several levels. The evaluation reports have been carried out in 3 stages:

- [1<sup>st</sup> evaluation report](#) (from 1<sup>st</sup> to 12<sup>th</sup> month – it can be checked on Google Drive and [Accesscult website](#))
- [2<sup>nd</sup> Evaluation report](#) (up to 20<sup>th</sup> month - it can be checked on Google Drive and [Accesscult website](#))
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Evaluation report or final report (up to 30<sup>th</sup> month): this document

For a correct quality assurance, the Project Management Group (PMG) monitors the progress of the project and contributes to the solution-oriented approach, conflict management, alignment with the time schedule. The PMG held online meetings in 3 transnational meetings (Coventry-UK, Maribor-Slovenia, and Klaipeda-Lithuania) and in 2 in person meetings (Turin – Italy and Burgos – Spain) and 5 additional online meetings in order to follow up the progress of the project.

PMG consists of the following people:

UNIVERSIDAD DE BURGOS	Jerónimo González
INFAD	José Ángel Casas
UNIVERZA V LJUBLAJNI	Alenka Bartulović (Jozé Hudaes) until 1the 5th month of the project lifetime)
INUK Institute	Darja Ivanuša Kline
KLAIPEDA UNIVERSITY	Ernesta Molotkienė
THE HISTORY MUSEUM OF LITHUANIA MINOR	Asta Grušelionienė
COVENTRY UNIVERSITY	Louise Moody (Sheena Gardner until the 4 <sup>th</sup> month of the project lifetime)
CULTURE COVENTRY	Martin Roberts
ISTITUTO DEI SORDI DI TORINO	Sofia Mastrokoulou

## 2. PROJECT OVERVIEW

### 2.1 Project Description

One billion people in the world live with some form of disability (WHO). At EU level, about 24% of persons aged 16 and over declared a disability; furthermore, the aging EU population is growing intensely. The number of people with access needs is therefore significant and growing. Equal integration into society, including travelling and experiencing cultural heritage is a real challenge. Cultural heritage (museums, galleries, monuments etc) provide significant opportunity for social inclusion, sense of community, informal education and lifelong learning; as such accessibility should not be a barrier! Better inclusion through Cultural Heritage (CH) interpretation is not just about social responsibility but is a business imperative representing market potential for tourism. This project tackles this need through education of students, future experts, but also current CH staff to improve access for all.

Project mission is to increase the accessibility of museums and galleries for People with Disabilities, to enable their participation in the activities carried out by museums and also to strengthen connections between museums and associations of disabled people, in order to create a basis for good cooperation in the future as well as to enrich regional policies with culture and heritage as added value for socio-cultural sustainability, by exchange experience amongst the partnership through synergy between higher education sector, cultural sector and disabled people with help of communication and collaboration, keeping in mind the effects of innovation and creating a base of knowledge that can span well beyond the project's end. In spite of growing number of projects and initiatives that engage People with Disabilities, rarely have they an opportunity to actively contribute to project results as co-creators.

The project is funded by the ERASMUS+ PROGRAMME of the European Commission and has lasted from September 1st, 2020, until February 28th, 2023.

### 2.2 Project wider objective

AccessCULT aims to IMPROVE ACCESSIBILITY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE across Europe through exchange of good practice and by developing, implementing, testing, improving and promoting an innovative multidisciplinary Higher Education (HE) module for students, future experts, and an adult training for existing cultural workers in order to develop knowledge, skills and competencies to enable cultural workers in museums and galleries to respond to the needs of visitors with wide ranging capabilities to ensure they are able to access, enjoy and benefit fully from our rich cultural heritage.

### 3. QUALITY ASSURANCE

#### MONITORING AND EVALUATION MEASURES TAKEN ALONG THE PROJECT

- PMG - Project Management Group (1 person/partner) was set to monitor the work plan implementation and evaluate the project results.
- A Lead partner per each WP was set to coordinate and monitor the WP's implementation.
- 5 Partner meetings --> to report about the progress of the project and evaluate weaknesses, strengths, delays, risks, poor quality.
- Other 5 online meetings were held for work purposes and to solve operational problems.
- TO DO LISTS and reminders by lead partner (UBU) and WP lead partners were sent to partners when necessary.
- A Cloud-computing (Google Drive) was used as a centralised archive in order to follow the work carried out and the results already achieved.
- INFAD, together with lead partner (UBU) guided the whole Evaluation process (through Evaluation strategy, Evaluation reports and Evaluation questionnaires for all the multiplier events, intellectual outputs, learning activities, implementations and meetings of the project).
- Multiplier events and Final International Conference were organised to receive feedback on the teaching materials.
- The development of intellectual outputs were discussed in all the partner meetings.
- All the meetings held have been planned by sending an agreed agenda in advance and agreed in Doodle to ensure the full assistance of the partnership. Also, the presentations related to intellectual products, the info-pack with all the necessary flight and accommodation data in the case of the transnational meetings, the financial matters of the project and the drafting of the minutes agreed upon by all the partners.

#### EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT:

INFAD, together with all the partners, worked to ensure optimal quality of the work, results and time management. The following activities were undertaken:

- Development of the project evaluation strategy and monitoring chart.
- Evaluation of the learning, teaching and training activities, pilot trainings and their implementation (Train-The-Trainers (C1 and C2), Blended Mobility Visit (C3), Pilot Visit Museums, Implementation of 1-month online adult training course and implementation of 6-month HEI module).
- Evaluation of multiplier events and final international conference.
- Evaluation of partnership's satisfaction.
- Evaluation of the partner meetings, both in person and online.



- Evaluation reports (released in 12<sup>th</sup>, 20<sup>th</sup> and 30<sup>th</sup> month).

#### QUALITY MEASURES:

All the indicators necessary to evaluate the project results were developed in the Evaluation Plan and displayed in the monitoring chart to be assessed through the 3 evaluation reports (see section 5 of this document)

The Evaluation Plan was divided in 7 Work Packages and all the questionnaires or other evaluations tools used to evaluate participants satisfaction were designed to collect comments on the following fields (not exhaustive list):

- Overall satisfaction.
- Accordance of the event/training with project objectives.
- Gaining of knowledge and skills by participants.
- Evaluation questionnaire for multipliers and stakeholders.



## 4. EVALUATION OF MAIN OBJECTIVES

Objective	Progress	Deviation
Create an on-line EU POINT	Done Released on the project's website	
Higher Education MODULE	Done. Released on website	-
(ON-LINE) ADULT TRAINING	Done. Released on website	-
Organise 10 pilot museum tours for disabled visitors	Done. 7 pilot museum tours performed	2 HEI partners (UL and CU) didn't participate but support to their national partners and IST integrated in 1 tour the 2 visits programmed for Italy. This didn't affect to the implementation phase as more than 100 participants were involved in the pilot tours.
Organise 5-day Train-The-Trainer for HEI	Done. Held in September 2021	Minor deviation as they were planned for August and it was held online due to Covid-19
Organise 5-day Train-The-Trainer for adult staff	Done. Held in September 2021	Minor deviation as they were planned for August and it was held online due to Covid-19
Organise 1-month mobility for students	Done. Held in October 2022	Minor deviation as it was finally organised for 15 days of the mobility visit in person. A 30 day in-country visit was found to be too disruptive to the students due to the scheduling of teaching and assessments on pre-requisite taught programmes in the home institutions. Nevertheless, the goals planned in the application form were achieved.
Create an Accessible Museum Ambassadors network	Done Released on the project's website	-

Validate learning outcomes	Done Integrated in Testing and Implementation phase (IO5)	-
Business plan and Recommendations for System & Policy makers	Done Integrated in Exploitation and Sustainability Plan (IO6)	-

## 5. EVALUATION OF WORK PACKAGES

In this section, all the indicators established in Monitoring Chart are analysed to know both to what extent they have been achieved and the level and quality of the progress performed by each one.

This analysis is carried out through the 7 Work Packages, making:

- firstly, an analysis of Milestones established in the submission proposal and,
- secondly, an analysis of the indicators (developed in the Evaluation Strategy and stated all of them in explicit and measurable terms).

Detailed info about of this analysis can be found on Drive: [Monitoring Chart](#)

Tools used in this evaluation:

WORK PACKAGES	
WP1 – Project Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effective Partnership Questionnaire</li> <li>- Timesheets</li> <li>- Financial Statements and reports</li> <li>- Partner meetings agendas and questionnaires</li> </ul>
WP2: In-depth Analysis and Specification of Learning Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Effective Partnership Questionnaire</li> <li>- Kick-off meeting questionnaires</li> <li>- Reports on IO1 and IO2</li> <li>- Online survey after carrying out the virtual knowledge visit</li> </ul>
WP3: HE modules "Cultural Heritage for All" development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiplier Events report and attendance lists</li> <li>- Multiplier Events satisfaction survey</li> <li>- Train-The-Trainer (TTT) Attendance list</li> <li>- TTT satisfaction survey</li> <li>- Effective Partnership Questionnaire</li> <li>- Satisfaction surveys of students participating in pilot experiences</li> <li>- Satisfaction survey on teaching materials</li> </ul>
WP4: (On-line) adult training "Cultural Heritage for All" development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Multiplier Events report and attendance lists</li> <li>- Multiplier Events satisfaction survey</li> <li>- Train-The-Trainer (TTT) Attendance list</li> <li>- TTT satisfaction survey</li> <li>- Effective Partnership Questionnaire</li> <li>- Satisfaction survey on teaching materials and learning environment</li> </ul>
WP5: Testing and Implementation phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Satisfaction surveys of students participating in the 6-month HE</li> </ul>

	<p>training.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Satisfaction surveys of cultural workers participating in the 1-month adult training</li> <li>- Pilot museum tours report and satisfaction survey</li> <li>- Specification and evaluation of Learning Outcomes</li> <li>- Other tools used in WP3 and WP4</li> </ul>
WP6: Promotion and Dissemination Campaign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Dissemination plan</li> <li>- Dissemination Report Excel Template</li> <li>- Project's Website</li> <li>- Google Analytics</li> <li>- Contact lists / Emails</li> <li>- Reports</li> <li>- FB measuring tools</li> <li>- LinkedIn measuring tools</li> <li>- Attendance lists</li> <li>- Other tools used in other WPs</li> </ul>
WP7: Exploitation and Sustainability Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Business Plan</li> <li>- Letters, emails, participants lists etc</li> <li>- Analysis of project's data: website, surveys, reports</li> </ul>

## Analysis of Work Packages

### WP1 - Project Management

Project Management is structured under Work Package 1: coordination and management of the project, coordination of time factors, conflict management, control over quality development and realization of results during the whole project life cycle.

During the 30 months of the Project lifetime all the features needed for a smooth management were created: Grant Agreement, Financial Statement and Budget, Timeline, Responsible Declaration and Data protection, Timesheets, Contact list, and templates. All these documents are accessible to all partners on a Drive folder. For Partner Meetings, an independent folder "Meetings" was created and another one for the Evaluation of the project (WP8), "Quality and social impact" with the following files and instruments for the project evaluation: PMG, Monitoring Chart, Logging Sheet, Evaluation Plan and Effective Partnership Questionnaire.

According to Lead Partner, University of Burgos, in general there was a good predisposition from most of the partners and their involvement in the project was adequate. On the other hand, it is true that some deadlines have not been met by some partners, but, according to evaluator's experience, all these issues are within the normal evolution of a project with 9 partners involved in. Planned meetings (5) were held on time as well as other five online meetings necessary for a better coordination of the project.

Milestones	Progress
Progress reports for the National Agency	Interim report was approved by National Agency
Final report for the National Agency	Prepared on time
5 partner meetings	5 out of 5. Everything was carried out according to initial plan. In addition to this, 5 online meetings were also held for a better coordination of the project.
Evaluation reports	1 <sup>st</sup> evaluation report (12 <sup>th</sup> month) carried out in time 2 <sup>nd</sup> evaluation report (20 <sup>th</sup> month) carried out in time Final evaluation report (30 <sup>th</sup> month) carried out in time

INDICATORS	Result	Description	Deviation	Solution / Explanation
Quantitative				
1. NA reports submitted in time (2)				
Midterm Report (1)	Approved by National Agency	Sent in time. All partners collaborated with tasks proposed to comply with deadlines		NA comments can be found on Drive
Final report (1)	Carried out in time			
2. Progress Reports submitted in time (6)				
1st period from September 2020 to April 2021.	All partners have submitted			
2nd period from May 2021 to August 2021.	All partners have submitted			
3rd period from September 2021 to January 2022.	All partners have submitted		Minor delays	
4th period from February 2022 to August 2022.	All partners have submitted		Minor delays	
5th period from September 2022 to November 2022.	All partners have submitted		Minor delays	
6th period from December 2022 to February 2023.	All partners have submitted		Minor delays	
3. Financial reports submitted in time (4)				
1st Period from September 2020 to April 2021	Issues pointed out in 1st evaluation report were solved			
2nd Period from May 2021 to January 2022	All partners have submitted			
3rd Period from February 2022 to August 2022	All partners have submitted			

4th Period from September 2022 to February 2023	All partners have submitted			
4. Partner Meetings (5)				
Country: United Kingdom	Goal achieved, according to the plan	It was held virtually due to the Covid-19 restrictions (force majeure).		
Country: Slovenia	Goal achieved, according to the plan	It was held virtually due to the Covid-19 restrictions (force majeure).		
Country: Lithuania	Goal achieved, according to the plan	It was held virtually due to the Covid-19 restrictions (force majeure).		
Country: Italy	Held on 7-8 of June 2022, according to the plan	In person meeting	KU participated via online and HMLM didn't participate	
Country: Spain	Held on February 23-24, 2023, according to the plan	In person meeting	2 partners didn't participate in person	Despite INFAD didn't attend the meeting, it did submit their presentations to be reviewed by the partnership and in the case of Culture Coventry, its presentation was presented by Coventry University. Therefore, even if there was no presence, all the planned topics were covered and the objectives of the meeting were met without problem.
<u>Qualitative</u>				
1. Progress reports (6)				
1st period from September 2020 to April 2021. Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	11 participants / At least 1 person per partner participated	Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	Submitted on time	Total average: 4,21. It is first questionnaire and not possible to compare



2nd period from May 2021 to August 2021. Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	11 participants / At least 1 person per partner participated	Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	Submitted on time	Total average: 4,34. Slightly improve in comparison with 1st questionnaire
3rd period from September 2021 to January 2022. Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	7 participants answered, at least 1 person per partners	2 partners didn't answer despite being asked them to respond it several times	Corrective action: 2 partners didn't participate. Minor delay. Questionnaire was sent in April.	Total average: 4,48. Slightly improve in comparison with 1st questionnaire
4th period from February 2022 to August 2022. Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	Not sent	4th partner meeting in Turin was enough to know the evolution of the project and partnership issues		
5th period from September 2022 to November 2022. Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	Not sent	5th partner online meeting was enough to know the evolution of the project and partnership issues		
6th period from December 2022 to February 2023. Questionnaire on management / dissemination / deliverables / quality / implementation and target groups	11 participants. At least 1 person per partner answered			Total average: 4,43. In line with previous questionnaire
2. Partner meetings (5)				
Country: United Kingdom	18 participants answered the questionnaire.	All the questions obtained an average of 4,8 app. (where 5 is totally satisfied).	Delayed due to COVID-19. Project was approved by NA in September and it was necessary	5 respondents wrote some comments regarding the meeting. This feedback was positive.

			some time to coordinate partners and prepare materials for Knowledge Visit. It was held online due to COVID-19 restrictions	
Country: Slovenia	17 participants answered the questionnaire.	All the questions obtained an average of 4,6 app. (where 5 is totally satisfied). The feedback collected was positive but some issues were exposed	Delayed because the Kick-off meeting was postponed to the end of November.	Feedback from participants that should be taken into account for the next meetings: - promote a little bit more the dissemination activities. - introduce 10 minutes breaks every hour and a half to allow participants to take comfort breaks - When questions were raised, there was not enough discussion to resolve any issues, unfortunately. - It would be useful to have the meeting sent out as a calendar appointment with all the relevant information attached so we know where to find it all, especially with the change of meeting time." - We should take more time for the management of the project. - During On-line meetings there could be more contribution from partners
Country: Lithuania	15 participants answered the questionnaire. At least one person per partner.	All the questions obtained an average of 4,6 app. (where 5 is totally satisfied). The feedback collected was positive but some issues were exposed	Delay. Questionnaire was sent in April.	Questionnaire should sent within the 7 days after the meeting

Country: Italy	11 participants answered the survey. At least 1 per partner who attended the meeting	All the questions obtained an average of 4,45. (where 5 is totally satisfied). The feedback collected was positive but some issues were exposed	Questionnaire was sent on time but some partners answered late	More reminders to those partners who don't answer on time
Country: Spain	11 participants answered the survey. At least 1 per partner who attended the meeting	All the questions obtained an average of 4,75 (where 5 is totally satisfied). The feedback collected was very positive.	Questionnaire was sent on time but some partners answered late	

## WP2: In-depth Analysis and Specification of Learning Outcomes

IO1 "Research" report and IO2 "Educational Module Framework and Design" is part of the WP2. It is necessary to clarify that these IOs have not been financed, hence they have been carried out with the partners' own resources and, their planned activities were shortened, but, on the other hand, the expected objectives and results have been achieved, as it was stated in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> evaluation report.

Only 2 minor issues, regarding translations into 4 partner languages, were pointed out in the 1<sup>st</sup> evaluation report that were solved in the period related to the 2<sup>nd</sup> report. Nothing to add in the final evaluation report.

IO1 and IO2, available in 5 partner languages, can be found on the website section: ["Intellectual Outputs"](#)

Milestones	Progress
Clear definition of needs (especially disabled and cultural workers) and state of art, existing projects and available teaching contents	Achieved
Specification of competences and learning outcomes according to previous milestone results	Achieved

INDICATORS	Result	Description	Deviation	Solution / Explanation
<u>Quantitative</u>				
1. Research Report (IO1)				
No. of attendees in Knowledge visit	Held on 24th November 2020 / 18 participants	It was held virtually due to the Covid-19 restrictions (force majeure).	Delayed due to COVID-19 restrictions. Moreover, project was approved by NA in September, and it was necessary some time to coordinate partners and prepare materials for Knowledge Visit. It was held online due to COVID-19 restrictions	

No. of collection of projects, trainings and good practice examples	5 Strong Practices / 7 good practices with both online and physical tours. Descriptions and type of materials/devices available in each cultural site.  IO1 is translated in all partner languages and is uploaded to the website	Due to Covid-19, it was held virtually. So participants in their own time, looked at the online material and leave their comments on an online short questionnaire survey	Minor delay in translations in all partner languages.	
2. Specification of Learning outcomes (IO2)				
No. of Specification of Learning outcomes for HEI modules	12 competences developed  IO2 is translated in all partner languages and is uploaded to the website	Developed with theoretical and practical part and methodologies for each competence. Accessibility guidelines have been added to the document	Minor delay in translations in all partner languages.	
No. of Specification of Learning outcomes for Adult Training	12 competences developed  IO2 is translated in all partner languages and is uploaded to the website	Developed with theoretical and practical part and methodologies for each competence. Accessibility guidelines have been added to the document	Minor delay in translations in all partner languages.	
<u>Qualitative</u>				
1. Research Report (IO1)				
Set the foundation	18 participants answered the questionnaire.	All the questions obtained an average of 4,8 app. (where 5 is totally satisfied). The feedback collected was positive.	Delayed due to COVID. Project was approved by NA in September and it was necessary some time to	Only 5 out of 18 gave feedback.

			prepare materials for Knowledge Visit.	
Accuracy and precision of the identified good practices	6 persons from partners and 29 students participated in an online survey after carrying out the virtual knowledge visit.	Ethical approval was assigned to the study by CU to collect data in the online survey.	6% of responses by partners. 28% of responses by students.	Not all partners related to Cultural Heritage participated in the survey. Participants Students were involved from University of Burgos
Clearness of process and usefulness of guidelines materials and other tools.	Partners perception on IO1 is above 4 (where 5 is totally satisfied)	According to 4th partnership questionnaire the Clearness of the process and usefulness of guidelines, materials and other tools is above 4 (where 5 is totally satisfied)	-	-
2. Specification of Learning outcomes (IO2)				
Clearness of process and usefulness of guidelines materials and other tools.	Partners perception on IO2 is 4 (where 5 is totally satisfied)	According to 4th partnership questionnaire the Clearness of the process and usefulness of guidelines, materials and other tools is app. 3,75 (where 5 is totally satisfied)	-	-

### WP3: HE modules "Cultural Heritage for All" development

Objective of this WP (=IO3) was to prepare an extensive elective 6-month long study module "Accessible cultural heritage for All", complementary to many different disciplines.

IO3, available in 5 partner languages, can be found on the website section: ["Intellectual Outputs"](#)

Milestones	Progress
Development of HE module: Version 1, to be discussed at Round tables (Multiplier Events) with target groups + revised together with participants in a 5-day Train-The-Trainer.	4 Multiplier Events (Round Tables 1-4) were held. They were postponed according to the recommendation made by the National Agency after evaluating the proposal. Therefore, the events were moved at the end of the project, when the intellectual products were finalized. Train-The-Trainer (C1) was held in September 2021. The evaluation report of this event can be read on Drive: <a href="#">C1-Evaluation Report</a> The <a href="#">evaluation of multiplier events</a> can also be read on Drive.
HE module Version 2, according to evaluation of materials and learning outcomes gained through WP5 - Final version of HE module	Done Available final version of IO3 (in 5 partner languages) on the project website.

INDICATORS	Result	Description	Deviation	Solution / Explanation
<u>Quantitative</u>				
1. Development of HE MODULE (IO3)				
No. of Round tables (4)	4 M.E. held	They were held between June 2022 and January 2023	They were moved at the end of the project, according to National Agency suggestion, when the intellectual products were finalized	
No. of Round tables participants (at least 20 national participants for each round table = 80)	At least 20 people participated in each M.E.	23 - Spain / 37 - Slovenia / 20 - Lithuania / 22 - Italy	M.E. Spain: 17 of the 23 people that attended were eligible , as 6 were University of Burgos staff/students	



No. of Train-The-Trainer participants/trainees (10)	11 participants during the event held from 27.09.21 - 01.10.2021	3 from UBU, 3 from UL 2 from KU, 2 from IST, 1 from INUK	.+1	
Number of trainers at the TTT event (at least 5)	More than 5 trainers were involved in the TTT	Urša Valič Ernesta Molotokienė Mirian Santamaría Sofia Mastrokourou Sonja Bezjak Kerrie Suteu Robert Nolan Jana Kalin Barbara Šteh	.+5	
No. of academic staff involved in the project (at least 3/university)	Achieved by all HEI partners	6 by UBU / 4 by KU / 6 by UL / IST (not HEI partner was involved as weel)		
No. of HEI study programmes and departments involved in the implementation phase (at least 2/university)	Achieved by all HEI partners	2 by UBU / 2 by KU / 2 by UL / IST (not HEI partner) also collaborated		
2. Final Version of HE MODULE (IO3)				
No. of accessibility guidelines integrated in teaching/learning materials	5 Main guidelines are displayed in IO2	They were organized into 5 main ones, all of them are addressed in IO3. Within each one guideline there are a series of subtypes.		
No. of languages for HEI module with teaching materials and exercises (5)	HEI module is available in 5 languages			
No. of ECTS (at least 2-3 ECTS)	3 ECTS	It is an estimation		

Qualitative				
1. Development of HE MODULE (IO3)				
Round tables	Satisfaction of the explanation of IO3 was above 75% in 4 Multiplier Events	Spain: 4,41; Slovenia: 4,70; Lithuania: 4,57; Italy: 4,72 (out of 5)	Not all participants answered the survey. Nevertheless, the sample is enough with a 72% of respondents.	
Train-The-Trainer event	Held on 27th September to 1st October, 2021 - 4 satisfaction surveys - one per each module (3) and final survey	At least one participant per HEI partner answered the questions. Satisfaction of participants: Closed questions: 85% of satisfaction Open questions: >75% of comments were positive	8 out of 11 participants answered the final evaluation.	
Version 2 of HE Module	Satisfaction of students was above 75%	4,19 out of 5 / Knowledge increased 77,50 after piloting / Most of the comments were positive and constructive	32 out of 50 students answered the survey	
Development, testing and implementation, Clearness of the process and usefulness of guidelines, materials and other tools	In final survey, partners perception on IO3 is above 75%	Development, implementation and clearness of the process, usefulness of guidelines, materials and other tools is 4,44 (where 5 is totally satisfied)	-	-
2. Final Version of HE MODULE (IO3)				
Attractiveness and usability of the learning outcomes	Satisfaction of students was above 75%	4,24 out of 5 in 6-month implementation. 4,61 out of 5 in Mobility Visit		

3. Participants				
Project ex-ANTE and ex-POST comparative number of participants in IO3 activities	27 participants more than expected	M.E. 80/96 TTT-C1 participants 10/11 TTT-C1 trainees 5/10 Implementation HEI module 45/50 Mobility Visit 15/15 TOTAL 155/182		
Level of motivation and satisfaction of the participants in IO3 activities >75%	The overall satisfaction of participants in: Train-The-Trainer, Multiplier events, implementation of the module and blended mobility visit, was above 75%		Not all participants answered the questionnaires	

#### WP4: (On-line) adult training "Cultural Heritage for All" development

Aim of WP4 (=IO4) is an intensive adult training "Accessible cultural heritage for All" integrated in a well thought e-learning environment. WP4 is in progress.

The access to online course is available on the project's website, in [outputs section](#).

Milestones	Progress
Development of adult training materials: Version 1, to be discussed at Round Tables with target groups + revised together with participants in a 5-day Train-The-Trainer.	4 Multiplier Events (Round Tables 1-4) were held. They were postponed according to the recommendation made by the National Agency, after evaluating the proposal. Therefore, the events were moved at the end of the project, when the intellectual products were finalized. Train-The-Trainer (C2) was held in September. The evaluation of this event can be read here: <a href="#">C2-Evaluation report</a> The <a href="#">evaluation of multiplier events</a> can also be read on Drive.

Version 2, according to evaluation of materials and learning outcomes gained through WP5 - Final version of (online) adult training materials	Done Available final version of the online course (in 5 partner languages) on the project's website.
---	---

INDICATORS	Result	Description	Deviation	Solution / Explanation
<u>Quantitative</u>				
1. Development of adult training (IO4)				
No. of Round tables (4)	4 M.E. held	They were held between June 2022 and January 2023	They were moved at the end of the project, according to National Agency suggestion, when the intellectual products were finalized	
No. of Round tables participants (at least 20 national participants for each round table = 80)	At least 20 people participated in each M.E.	23 - Spain / 37 - Slovenia / 20 - Lithuania / 22 - Italy	M.E. Spain: 17 of the 23 people that attended were eligible, as 6 were University of Burgos staff/students	
No. of Train-The-Trainer participants/trainees (10)	10 participants during the event held from 20.09.21 - 24.09.2021	All partners involved in IO4 TTT participated: HMLM - INFAD - INUK - CC - IST		
Number of trainers at the TTT event (at least 5)	2 trainers were involved in the TTT	Kerrie Suteu Robert Nolan	-3 (Minor deviation)	Despite this indicator has not been achieved, both trainers are well experienced, with enough knowledge to cover the lack of more trainers
2. Final Version of Adult Training (IO4)				
No. of accessibility guidelines integrated in teaching/learning materials	5 Main guidelines are displayed in IO2	All of them are addressed in the 3 modules developed in IO4.		
No. of languages for Adult Training (5)	Online course is available in 5 partner languages.			

Qualitative				
1. Development of Adult Training (IO4)				
Round tables	Satisfaction of the explanation of IO4 was above 75% in 4 Multiplier Events	Spain: 4,54; Slovenia: 4,70; Lithuania: 4,71; Italy: 4,81 (out of 5)	Not all participants answered the survey. Nevertheless, the sample is enough with a 72% of respondents.	
Train-The-Trainer event	Held on 20th-24th September 2021 - 4 satisfaction surveys - one per each module (3) and final survey	At least one participant per partner answered the questions. Satisfaction of participants: Closed questions: 94% of satisfaction Open questions: >75% of comments were positive	9 out of 10 participants answered the final evaluation.	
Development, testing and implementation, Clearness of the process and usefulness of guidelines, materials and other tools	In final survey, partners perception on IO3 is above 75%	Development, implementation and clearness of the process, usefulness of guidelines, materials and other tools is 4,54 (where 5 is totally satisfied)		
2. Final Version of Adult Training (IO4)				
Accessibility and usability of OER	50 participants	The cultural professionals who attended the adult training evaluated it as interesting and well-presented (concise with essential information) and most of the participants wrote that they would recommend the course to their colleagues		
3. Participants				
Project ex-ANTE and ex-POST comparative number of participants in IO4 activities	18 participants more than expected	M.E. 80/96 TTT-C2 participants 10/10 TTT-C2 trainees 5/2 Implementation CH course 45/50 TOTAL 140/158		

Level of motivation and satisfaction of the participants in IO4 activities >75%	In Train-The-Trainer, Multiplier events and implementation of the online course, satisfaction of participants was above 75%		Not all participants answered the questionnaires	
---	---	--	--	--

## WP5: Testing and Implementation phase

Aim of IO5 was to test how useful, usable and quality the developed adult training materials (IO4) and HE teaching materials (IO3). It is necessary to clarify that this IO has not been financed, hence they have been carried out with the partners' own resources and the expected objectives and results have been achieved.

Milestones	Progress
1. Milestone: Recruitment of participants for implementation phase, formation of Multidisciplinary groups so that implementation in the 5 countries can start	All partner organizations published open calls and sent emails to students and cultural workers in order to invite them to attend the training. In the case of Museums visits, partners contacted various associations and organizations of people with disabilities and invited them to the museum tours.
2. Milestone: Successful implementation of at least 6-month HEI lectures in 3 countries (ES, SI, LT)	Carried out by HEI partners: University of Burgos, University of Ljubljana, and Klaipeda university
3. Milestone: Successful implementation of at least 1-month adult training in the 5 countries	Carried out by INFAD, INUK, Culture Coventry, HMLM and IST
4. Milestone: Implementation of at least 10 pilot museum tours in the 5 countries, where the trainees will be put in the real environment together with PWD in order to validate the learning outcomes of the trainings	7 pilot museums were finally carried out. 2 HEI partners (UL and CU) didn't participate but support to their national partners and IST integrated in 1 tour the 2 visits programmed for Italy. This didn't affect to the implementation phase as more than 100 participants and people with disabilities were involved in the pilot tours.

<p>5. Milestone: Successful implementation of students' short-term mobility &amp; report on their return</p>	<p>Students Mobility Visit was carried out and implemented in Coventry University with the support of Culture Coventry and HEI partners. The main deviation from the plan outlined was that the face-to-face mobility visit lasted 15 days in duration rather than 30 days. A 30 day in-country visit was found to be too disruptive to the students due to the scheduling of teaching and assessments on pre-requisite taught programmes in the home institutions. Nevertheless, the goals planned in the application form were achieved.</p>
--	--

INDICATORS	Result	Description	Deviation	Solution / Explanation
<u>Quantitative</u>				
1. Participants in testing and implementation phase				
No. of students participating in the 6-month pilot experience (15 per country ES, SI, LT = 45)	50 students	16 from UBU, 13 from KU and 21 from UL		
No. of HEI organisations involved in the 6-month HEI course (at least 3)	3 HEIs involved	UBU, UL and KU. They were supported by the other HEI partner: CU		
No. of cultural workers participating in 1-month pilot experience (at least 10 per country = 50)	50 participants involved	Participants were involved from all countries		
Number of CH institutions involved in the 1-month training (at least 5)	5 partners were involved (not HEI partners)	They were supported by HEI partners and some associated partners		



No. of HEI students in Blended mobility (5 each HEI partner = 15)	15 students involved	5 students from each HEI partners (UBU, UL, KU)		
2. Pilot Museum Tours				
Number of cultural heritage institutions involved in the Pilot museum tours (at least 5)	6 Cultural Heritage organizations involved	Museo de la Evolución Humana (Burgos), Klaipėda Castle (Klaipeda, Lithuania), Modern Art Gallery (Ljubljana, Slovenia), Herbert Art Gallery (UK) and Museo Extremeño e Iberoamericano de arte contemporáneo (Badajoz, Spain), Museum in Italy		
No of pilot museum tours (2 per country =10)	7 pilot museums		2 HEI partners (UL and CU) didn't participate but support to their national partners and IST integrated in 1 tour the 2 visits programmed for Italy.	This didn't affect to the implementation phase as more than 100 participants were involved in the pilot tours.
Number of students / CH workers and PWD involved in the Pilot museum tours (at least 150)	103 participants	Pilot museums were implemented in January 2023	The number is less than foreseen as 2 universities didn't participate	Despite the initial number of participants wasn't achieved, the majority of partners reported that the tours were well-accepted by people with disabilities and showed great interest in visiting the tours and were happy to give feedback on the adjustments that were made to their needs.

Qualitative				
1. Implementation of IO3 / IO4				
Satisfaction of students participating in the 6-month pilot experience	Satisfaction of students was above 75%	4,19 out of 5 / Knowledge increased 77,50 after piloting / Most of the comments were positive and constructive	32 out of 50 students answered the survey	
Satisfaction of cultural workers participating in 1-month pilot experience (at least 10 per country = 50)	50 participants	The cultural professionals who attended the adult training evaluated it as interesting and well-presented (concise with essential information) and most of the participants wrote that they would recommend the course to their colleagues		
Satisfaction of HEI students in Blended mobility (5 each HEI partner = 15)	Satisfaction of students was above 75%	Pre-visit evaluation: Motivation of students is aligned with intercultural experience, increase civic competences, professional competences as future heritage professionals Closed questions average = 4,60 that means a 91,90% of satisfaction level Open questions: >75% of comments are positive Posters: >75% of experiences are positive and are aligned with expectations	14 out of 15 participants answered the final evaluation.	INFAD evaluator claimed twice the need of being responded by all students.

2. Pilot Museum Tours				
Satisfaction of participants involved in the Pilot museum tours	Participants satisfaction is above 75%	4,69 out of 5. Comments were positive. The majority of partners reported that the tours were well-accepted by people with disabilities. They showed great interest in visiting the tours. They enjoyed the visits and were happy to give feedback on the adjustments that were made to their needs (audio descriptions, videos in sign language, Braille descriptions, raised surfaces and 3D forms of art pieces, etc.).	Not all participants answered the questionnaire	
3. Validation of learning outcomes				
Level of accomplishment of Final Learning Outcomes with Specification of Learning Outcomes (IO2)	Validation of Learning Outcomes is achieved	According to the report, 8 learning outcomes were validated, and all of them are adequately fulfilled.		
4. Participants				
Project ex-ANTE and ex-POST comparative number of participants in IO5 activities	Less participants than expected	Implementation HEI module 45/50 Implementation CH course 45/50 Mobility Visit 15/15 Pilot Museum Tours 150/103 TOTAL 255/238	Minor deviation because 2 HEI partners didn't participate	Despite the initial number of participants wasn't achieved, the majority of partners reported that the tours were well-accepted by people with disabilities and showed great interest in visiting the tours and were happy to give feedback on the adjustments that were made to their needs

Level of motivation and satisfaction of the participants in IO5 activities >75%	The overall satisfaction of participants was above 75% in: implementation of the HEI module, implementation of the online course and blended mobility visit,		Not all participants answered the questionnaires	
---	--	--	--	--

## WP6: Promotion and Dissemination Campaign

This WP has been an on-going process where all partners were involved.

The National Agency comments on the interim report were the following and they have been accomplished:

- The results of both the dissemination and the use of the project results are good.
- Multiplier Events (ME) haven't been held (scheduled April 2021) because it is proposed to hold these events in person to obtain the desired effect. In addition to this, the IO3 and IO4 are not fully finished, so it was necessary to postpone the MEs until when these IOs are finished.
- It is recommended to create the entries of IOs, MEs and C3 on the website and publish a brief description to create expectation in potential users

Milestones	Progress
Creation of an extensive Network of stakeholders	The number is reached if it is considered the sum of social media followers (FB, LinkedIn), social media private profiles, website visitors, newsletter recipients and participants of events.
Round tables to present IO1, 2, 3 and 4, and discussing the findings of IO1 and IO2, as well as the outline of IO3 & IO4 with cultural workers, PWD and decision makers.	4 Multiplier Events were held.
Final International Conference to present successful implementation of the project, its results and discussion on their sustainability, impact and follow-on.	Final International Conference was held on 25th February 2023

INDICATORS	Result	Description	Deviation	Solution / Explanation
<u>Quantitative</u>				
1. Dissemination plan				
No. of Dissemination Plan (1)	Submitted in March 2021			
No. of dissemination reports (2)	3 reports	Interim report, Mid-term report and Final report		
2. Corporate identity and Graphic design				
No. of logos (1)	Designed in January 2021			
No. of Templates for documents (1)	Designed in January 2021			
No. of PPT Presentation (1)	Designed in January 2021			
Brochures in 5 partner languages	Translated in all languages. Uploaded to the website.	It has been used in some congresses		
3. Website				
5 partner languages	Done	English, Slovenian, Lithuanian, Italian and Spanish		
Link to Facebook page	Done	There are also links to Instagram and Youtube project's accounts		
Link to on-line adult training contents	Done	Link to Coventry University Moodle platform through the project website		
Number of AccessCULT website visits/visitors (>100 new visitors/quarterly)	Achieved	According to Google Analytics: 3.300 new visitors between March 2021 and February 2023. It means an average of >350 new visitors for each quarter of the year. The total of visits in that period is over 18.000.		

4. Newsletters in 5 partner languages (4)				
Number of stakeholders reached (> 5000)	Data number is not provided clearly in Dissemination template			Each partner was invited to have their own repository of contacts and then reports only the number of them at the stage of reporting.
no. 1	Release in July 2021			
no. 2	Released in January 2022			-
no. 3	Released in July 2022			
no. 4	Released in January 2023			
5. Facebook (FB) website				
No. of FB followers (at least 200 )	292 followers (>92)	More than 8.000 accounts were reached (according to FB Statistics)		
No. of LinkedIn page members (at least 50)	118 members (>68)			
6. Network				
No. of EU network of stakeholders (>10000 stakeholders EU wide). Each partner will contribute with at least 550 contacts	The number (estimated) is reached	The number is reached if it is considered the sum of social media followers (FB, LinkedIn), social media private profiles, website visitors, newsletter recipients and participants of events.	It is not clear how the number could be counted (with a minimum of guarantee)	Each partner should had their own repository of contacts and then reports only the number of them at the stage of reporting.
No. of Ambassadors network with contact details published on the AccessCULT website (at least 20)	The number is reached	29 ambassadors from 5 partner countries		
7. Multiplier Events				
Round tables (4, at least 20 participants in each one)	4 Multiplier events were held	23 - Spain / 37 - Slovenia / 20 - Lithuania / 22 - Italy	M.E. Spain: 17 of the 23 people that attended were eligible, as 6 were University of Burgos staff/students	

No. of Final International Conference National Attendees (45)	Final Conference was held	49 national participants	9 of them were not eligible as they are UBU students/professors	
No. of Final International Conference International Attendees (15)	Final Conference was held	19 international participants	1 of them was not eligible as she was from a partner institution (UL)	
<u>Qualitative</u>				
1. Website				
Level of attractiveness, accessibility and usability of the project website	3 responses received with an average of: 4,33 (out of 5).	Also, in order to comply with the requirements of accessibility demanded by all kind of visitors a plugin (WP Accessibility Helper) was installed on the website. Through a button displayed on the front page of the website visitors can choose the way they want to see and use the website.		
2. Multiplier Events				
Positive feedback from the participants in project events	Participants satisfaction in all events was above 75%	M.E. 1 - SPAIN 4,54 (out of 5) / M.E. 2 - SLOVENIA 4,68 (out of 5) / M.E. 3 - LITHUANIA 4,76 (out of 5) / M.E. 4 - ITALY 4,82 (out of 5) / FINAL CONFERENCE 4,42 (out of 5)		
Project Ex-ANTE and ex-POST level of awareness of all targeted audiences on PWD matters	35 people with disabilities involved	All participants of the Pilot Museums felt that the content helped them to adapt their work to suit the needs of visitors with disabilities. In the HEI module implementation, the students gained a 78% of more knowledge regarding the accessibility for PWD.		



## WP7: Exploitation and Sustainability Plan

Although it was run throughout the whole project lifetime, the sustainability activities of the project were intensively carried out in the last 18 months (IO6). It is necessary to clarify that this IO has not been financed, hence they have been carried out with the partners' own resources and the expected objectives and results have been achieved.

Milestones	Progress
To develop a plan to ensure the network and project outcomes are embedded and sustained within each partner country.	It is developed through the Intellectual Output IO6 "Catalogue of Recommendations and Follow-Up Opportunities"

Indicators	Result	Description	Deviation	Improvement
<u>Quantitative</u>				
1. Business plan				
No. of Business opportunities and recommendations specified in the plan	19 opportunities and recommendations	A list of potential exploitable results of the project was generated through brainstorming, followed by the establishment of a timeline within which they could be executed.	19 opportunities and recommendations	A list of potential exploitable results of the project was generated through brainstorming, followed by the establishment of a timeline within which they could be executed.
2. Catalogues				
No. of System and Policy Makers reached with (on-line) Catalogue of recommendations for Systems and Policy Makers (at least 2/country = 10 all together)	Catalogue is created		No data to analyse	
No. of stakeholders reached with (on-line) catalogue of funding sources, implementation possibilities for follow up activities (at least 2/country = 10 all together)	Not achieved			It is an activity not funded by NA. Partners will work on this after the project end.

3. Ambassadors				
No. of EU Accessibility Ambassadors (at least 20 from at least 5 partner countries)	29 ambassadors	Italy 3 / Lithuania 4 / Spain 11 / Slovenia 6 / UK 5		
Qualitative				
1. Stakeholders / Indirect Target Groups				
Significant interest in the outputs from HEI, CH institutions, tourism entrepreneurs, media and other stakeholders in each partner country;	Interest in Multiplier Events and Final Conference was clear	IO1, IO2, IO3 and IO4 were rated above 4 (out of 5) in the 5 events		
Adoption/usage of thematic reports by organisations external to the partnership;	Usefulness of the project outputs was clear	In all the 5 events, the questions regarding if the contents of the IOs were relevant to their job / career and to their future projects were rated above 4 (out of 5)		
Public interest in the project progress e.g. by media and cultural organisations globally;	15 news were released in external media	Media based activities; Newspaper, Specialist magazine, Radio and Tv		

## 6. QUESTIONNAIRE ABOUT EFFECTIVE PARTNERSHIP

Through this instrument, internal evaluator has collected qualitative indicators from partners, especially their thoughts related to the evolution of the project.

### 6.1 RESULTS OF THE 4 QUESTIONNAIRES

	1 <sup>st</sup> Questionnaire	2 <sup>nd</sup> Questionnaire	3 <sup>rd</sup> Questionnaire	4 <sup>th</sup> Questionnaire
PERIOD	Up to April 2021	Up to Aug. 2021	Up to April 2022	May 2022 to February 2023
PARTICIPANTS	11 from 9 partners	11 from 9 partners	7 from 7 partners**	11 from 9 partners
AVERAGE RATE*	4,21	4,34	4,48	4,43
MANAGEMENT*	4,42	4,33	4,15	4,39
IMPLEMENTATION*	3,94	4,31	4,03	4,22
TARGET GROUPS*	3,99	3,76	4,65	4,37
QUALITY ASSURANCE*	4,44	4,45	4,59	4,56
DELIVERABLES/ACTIVITIES*	4,04	4,65	4,77	4,50
AWARENESS-RAISING & EXPLOITATION*	4,47	4,53	4,64	4,51

\*Max. rate is 5.

\*\*Culture Coventry and Klaipeda University didn't answer despite they were asked several times to respond the survey

According to data collected from the final questionnaire, its rating is in line with previous questionnaires.

### 6.2 COMMENTS FROM FINAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Below, the opinions left by respondents in each section and followed by a list of strengths and critical points of the project so far.

More detailed info at [DRIVE Effective Partnership Questionnaire](#)

#### MANAGEMENT

As in previous questionnaires, one comment asked for a better communication among partners, but other was totally on the contrary:

- *We really liked the whole organisation of the project management! Good job!*
- *Make stronger and personal bonds with partners to improve communication with them.*

## IMPLEMENTATION

As it is stated in other sections, the comments are focusing on the need of doing all the activities reflected on the application form but many of them were not financed, what it means a problem for the implementation of the project:

- *Alignment of the expenses with the project specifications was rated lower because we had to prepare all the IO's exactly how was described in the application despite not having a budget for certain IO's*
- *Improve communication, make yourself visible, make not only comments on what is not done, but tell to partners what was really good that was done etc.*

## TARGET GROUPS

In the same line of the previous questionnaires, one partner points out of the need of involving more People with disabilities in partners organizations. Perhaps it is personal view and don't take into account that partners have different structures and objectives (one of the strengths of this partnership) but don't mean that all partners had the capacity to involve PWD in the project events from other organizations (associated partners for example):

- *PWD should be more involved in all partners organisations.*

## QUALITY ASSURANCE

In the same line of the previous questionnaire, there is one comment that points out the difficulty to answer some questions of this questionnaire. Moreover, other partner is tired of questionnaires. Perhaps there were many questionnaires during the project but the activities, the different events and the implementation of the project obliged to have a good evaluation:

- *as per above i'm not sure i am answering correctly with some of these if we are being asked to agreed, or asked to say they are good with 5 high?*
- *Less questions and questionnaires.*

## DELIVERABLES/ACTIVITIES

In the same line of other section, the overload of work (and not financed) is pointed out again:

- *Too much translations, non sense bureaucracy and work on IO's that were not finances, took energy and time to other more important IO's*

## AWARENESS-RAISING AND EXPLOITATION

In the same line of the previous questionnaires, some partners' perception is the need of more dissemination activities in media. On the contrary, one partner points out the sustainability of the project and the capacity of generating future networks:

- *We really liked the fact that we created qualitative materials that can be implemented furtherly in all museums in Piedmont. We have already started forming stable and strong relationships with potential stakeholders who are willing to use the produced outputs. Some of them are:*

*ERGON a favore dei Sordi, Microkosmos.*

- *More engagement from partners to reach the mass media, more engagement in public relations and promotions of the project.*

#### PLEASE LIST THE STRENGTHS OF THE PROJECT SO FAR

Despite the need of more communication among partners in previous questionnaires, most of partners have answered to this question highlighting the good outputs, the balanced partnership and the sustainability of the project, all of this despite the budget was cut and many of the activities were not financed.

- *The strengths of the project are attention to diversity, and the possibilities offered to this group of people with disabilities and to be able to undertake future actions*
- *Different and strong partners and sharing of good practices;*
- *Effective and long -term impact on the training of adults and students;*
- *Preparation of international training content for adults and students;*
- *The involvement of people with a disability in the project activities."*
- *The excellent communication among partners*
- *Good results were done, by the minimum of finances (this should not be applied by the NA as a rule, it is an exception).*
- *Clarity of project management, simplicity of reporting and support with this by the project managers, discussions around accessibility and resulting online course*

#### PLEASE LIST THE CRITICAL POINTS OF THE PROJECT SO FAR

If in previous questionnaires, some partners' perception was the need of more communication among partners and discussion through more meetings, in the final questionnaire the point was focused on other difficulties like the overload of work:

- *The project's weaknesses would be communication with governments and society when implementing the planned solutions.*
- *There was a bureaucracy and many administrative documents to send every 6 months*
- *Communication with NA, they were not responding; project partners were overload with work that was not financed and mere bureaucratic (ex. certificates, lists of presences, etc. some documents that nobody will ever read...). To us was an exhausting and one of the most difficult projects.*
- *The use of the Moodle platform for IO4 as it is becoming a redundant platform, but was the only platform which didn't carry an additional cost*

## 7. CRITICAL POINTS AND CORRECTIVE ACTIONS TAKEN

Firstly, it is necessary to consider three constraints that have affected to the evolution of the project:

1. Delay on the project approval by National Agency: 1 month
2. 31 % of the budget was cut. The project consisted of many IOs. but only 2 of them were financed, so, the rest were developed with the partners own resources.
3. COVID-19 restrictions have affected to partner meetings and some dissemination activities during the first 18 months of the project lifetime.

MONITORING CRITICAL POINTS OF THE 1<sup>st</sup> EVALUATION REPORT:

1 <sup>ST</sup> EVALUATION REPORT	MONITORING
<i>Progress reports sent with a deviation of 3 months by some partners</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> There are still some minor delays and issues. Lead partner has applied corrective actions setting a deadline with enough time to comply with tasks asked for.
<i>IO1 is not translated into all partners languages</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> IO1 is translated in 5 partner languages, and all are uploaded to the website
<i>IO2 is not translated into all partners languages</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> IO2 is translated in 5 partner languages, and all are uploaded to the website
<i>Website is not translated in Slovene yet.</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> Website is available in Slovene and the other 4 partner languages
<i>It is necessary to create an EU network of Stakeholders</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> EU network is not created as a whole and at the disposal of all partners due to Data Protection Law. Each partner had their own repository of contacts and then reports only the number of them at the stage of reporting.
<i>Dissemination report (Excel document) is not updated</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> Dissemination report was updated by partners, from time to time, always with gentle reminders by dissemination lead partner.
<i>Partner Meetings: according to meetings evaluations, there is a need of more time for discussion among participants and more contribution from partners during the meetings.</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> Last meeting evaluation didn't have any comments regarding these issues. In addition to this, the partner meetings are reinforced with online meetings (4)
<i>Improve the daily/weekly communication among partners, with reminders of deadlines, partners involved in each one as well as internal reports that reflect the progress carried out.</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> The final meetings and Final Effective Partnership Questionnaires were good in this issue.



MONITORING CRITICAL POINTS OF THE 2<sup>ND</sup> EVALUATION REPORT:

2 <sup>ND</sup> EVALUATION REPORT CRITICAL POINTS	MONITORING
<i>Effective Partnership Questionnaires continue pointing out the need of Communication among partners, more dialogue, discussion and joint work.</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> The final meetings and Final Effective Partnership Questionnaires were good in this issue.
<i>Some partners didn't answer to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Effective Partnership Questionnaire despite being claimed to do it This also happened with Train-The-Trainers final evaluations (C1 &amp; C2).</i>	<b>RESOLVED.</b> The questionnaires afterwards (meetings, mobility visit, multiplier events, effective partnership) were filled out by 85% or more of the participants involved in. In the case of partners, the questionnaires were filled out by at least one person for each partner.

ACTIONS TAKEN TO RESOLVE THE CRITICAL POINTS:

- Multiplier Events were finally set at the end of the project, when IO3 and IO4 was finished according to NA advice.
- Dissemination activities were updated in [Dissemination Report](#). Dissemination leader partner made gentle reminders from time to time to involve all partners.
- It was agreed that each partner had their own repository of contacts and then reported only the number of them at the stage of reporting.
- A better and direct communication between project lead partner (UBU) and lead partners of IO3, IO4, IO5 and IO6 was set.
- All partners have collaborated by contributing their own resources to carry out the non-funded IOs. To this end, the work has been significantly increased and these non-funded IOs have followed the same follow-up and monitoring treatment to ensure that their quality is equally high.





ACCESSCULT

Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



## WHO WE ARE

